

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE  
9

10                 LEO GUY, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated,

11                 Plaintiff,

12                  v.

13                 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING,  
INC.,

14                 Defendant.

10                 CASE NO. C22-1558 MJP

11                 ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
CONSOLIDATE

16                 RYAN TANNER, individually, and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

17                 Plaintiff,

18                  v.

19                 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING,  
INC.,

20                 Defendant.

16                 CASE NO. C22-1562 MJP

1 MAGALY GRANADOS, individually,  
2 and on behalf of all others similarly  
3 situated,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

6 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING,  
INC.,

7 Defendant.  
8

9 KERRY LAMONS, individually, and on  
10 behalf of all others similarly situated,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING,  
14 INC.,

15 Defendant.  
16

17 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Consolidate. (Dkt. No. 9.)  
18

19 Having reviewed the Motion, noted the lack of any opposition, and all supporting materials, the  
20 Court GRANTS the Motion and ORDERS that the above-captioned cases be consolidated for all  
21 purposes.  
22

23 The plaintiffs in four different actions filed against Defendant Convergent Outsourcing,  
24 Inc. ask the Court to consolidate all four into a single action.  
25

26 Under Rule 42(a), the Court may consolidate cases that involve common questions of law  
27 or fact. Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). The Court enjoys broad discretion in making this determination.  
28 See Inv'rs Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Cent. Dist. of Cal., 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir.  
29 1989). The Court usually considers several factors in analyzing consolidation, including judicial  
30

CASE NO. C22-1590 MJP

CASE NO. C22-1597 MJP

1 economy, whether consolidation would expedite resolution of the case, whether separate cases  
2 may yield inconsistent results, and the potential prejudice to a party opposing. See 9 Charles  
3 Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil § 2383 (3rd ed. 2020).

4 Consolidation is appropriate here given that the four actions present common questions of  
5 law and fact and there are substantial efficiencies to be gained. All four actions concern the same  
6 data breach resulting from a cyber-attack on Convergent. And plaintiffs pursue the same or  
7 similar causes of action against Convergent on behalf of overlapping proposed classes.  
8 Consolidation for all purposes will further conserve party and judicial resources. Convergent has  
9 not voiced any opposition, and the Court is unaware of any inconvenience, delay, confusion, or  
10 prejudice that may result from consolidation. As such, the Court GRANTS the Motion and  
11 consolidates all four actions.

12 All filings in this consolidated action shall be filed on the docket of the first-filed case  
13 (C22-1558) with the following caption:

14  
15 LEO GUY, individually, and on behalf  
16 of all others similarly situated,  
17  
18 Plaintiff,

19 v.  
20 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING,  
21 INC.,  
22  
23 Defendant.

CASE NO. C22-1558 MJP

24 The Clerk is directed to file this Order in all four cases and then administratively close  
the following related cases: (1) C22-1562 MJP; (2) C22-1590 MJP; and (3) C22-1597 MJP.

\\

The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

Dated December 13, 2022.

Wesley Pekom

Marsha J. Pechman  
United States Senior District Judge